IRO Certificate #4599

NOTICE OF INDEPENDENT REVIEW DECISION

August 8, 2002

Re: IRO Case # M2-02-0725-01
Texas Worker's Compensation Commission:
has been certified as an independent review organization (IRO) and has been authorized to perform independent reviews of medical necessity for the Texas Worker's Compensation Commission (TWCC). Texas HB. 2600, Rule133.308 effective January 1, 2002, allows a claimant or provider who has received an adverse medical necessity determination from a carrier's internal process, to request an independent review by an IRO.
In accordance with the requirement that TWCC assign cases to certified IRO's, TWCC assigned this case to for an independent review has performed an independent review of the proposed care to determine if the adverse determination was appropriate. For that purpose, received relevant medical records, any documents obtained from parties in making the adverse determination, and any other documents and/or written information submitted in support of the appeal.
The case was reviewed by a physician who is Board Certified in Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation. He or she has signed a certification statement attesting that no known conflicts of interest exist between him or her and any of the treating physicians or providers, or any of the physicians or providers who reviewed the case for a determination prior to referral to for independent review. In addition, the certification statement further attests that the review was performed without bias for or against the carrier, medical provider, or any other party to this case.
The reviewer who reviewed this case has determined that, based on the medical records provided, the requested treatment is not medically necessary. Therefore, agrees with the adverse determination regarding this case. The reviewer's decision and the specific reasons for it, is as follows:

History

This case involves a 45-year-old male who injured his left ankle and foot on ____ when a 900 pound hamper rolled over his left foot, causing him to fall and his ankle to twist. There was immediate pain. X-rays were negative for fracture. An MRI was unremarkable. All neurologic work-up was negative. The pain in his foot and ankle persisted. The patient was later diagnosed with Morton's Neuroma. The patient was treated with physical therapy, work hardening program and multidisciplinary pain management program, but the pain in his foot persisted. A Functional Capacity Evaluation 3/25/01indicated the patient could work at the medium demand level, but his job involves a

ver	ry heavy demand level.
	quested Service ork Conditioning Program
	cision gree with the carrier's decision to deny the requested program.
The injust 10 doc	e patient has already been through adequate and extensive non-surgical treatment for the ury to his ankle, including physical therapy, several weeks of work hardening and sessions of a multidisciplinary pain management program. There is no evidence in the cumentation that indicates that the patient would further benefit from a work additioning program. Surgical treatment of the Morton's Neuroma might be considered.
	cal necessity decision by an Independent Review Organization is deemed to be a on decision and order.
	YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST A HEARING
-	ty to this medical dispute may disagree with all or part of the decision and has a right a hearing.
and it mus	ng a spinal surgery prospective decision, a request for a hearing must be in writing, at be received by the TWCC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within 10 (ten) days of your this decision (28 Tex. Admin. Code 142.5(c)).
hearing m	ng other prospective medical necessity (preauthorization) decisions, a request for a ust be in writing, and it must be received by the TWCC Chief Clerk of Proceedings (twenty) days of your receipt of this decision (28 Tex. Admin. Code 148.3).
102.4(h) o Chief Cler	ion is deemed received by you 5 (five) days after it was mailed (28 Tex. Admin. Code or 102.5(d). A request for a hearing should be sent to: rk of Proceedings, Texas Worker's Compensation Commission, P O Box 40669, X 78704-0012. A copy of this decision should be attached to the request.
1 2	appealing this decision shall deliver a copy of its written request for a hearing to all es involved in the dispute (Commission Rule 133.308(t)(2)).
Sincerely,	